



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/079,850	05/15/98	GENOV	G 010063-020

ROBERT E KERBS
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS
PO BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

MM51/0819

EXAMINER

SIRCUS, B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2837

DATE MAILED:

08/19/98

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/079,850

Applicant(s)

Genov et al.

Examiner

Brian Sircus

Group Art Unit

2837



- Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

- Claim(s) 1-7, 15-19, 31, 35, 39, and 44-48 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1-7, 15-19, 31, 35, 39, and 44-48 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2837

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 line 5, there is a left bracket between axis and whereby. There is no corresponding right bracket to indicate where the deletion ends.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata et al. (4,488,242) in view of Ueyama et al. (5,571,325). Tabata et al. discloses a robot controller that moves a two joint robot in off-axis liner motions and uses a optical position detection to aid in control. Tabata et al. does not disclose use of an end effector. Ueyama et al. discloses a plural robotic controller device used to move substrates to and from various positions that uses end effectors to grasp and move the substrates (figs 12,14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the apparatus of Tabata et al. to use an end effector because Ueyama et al. teaches that using end effectors allows the robot to perform a task, which is a desirable feature when the robot is used in a manufacturing environment.

Art Unit: 2837

Claims 4, 6, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata et al. and Ueyama et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nishida et al. (4,680,802). Tabata et al. discloses a robot controller that may be modified according to the teachings of Ueyama et al. to use an end effector but neither of these references disclose using the robot in conjunction with a conveyor. Nishida et al. discloses a robotic system that uses a conveyor belt. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified the controller of Tabata et al. to use a conveyor because Nishida et al. teaches that this is a good system for positioning work pieces in a location in which the robot may access them.

Claims 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata et al. and Ueyama et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tateyama et al. (5,202,716). Tabata et al. discloses a robot controller that may be modified according to the teachings of Ueyama et al. to use an end effector but neither of these references disclose a waiting section located between two robot stations. Tateyama et al. discloses a wafer processing device in which two separate robot arms exchange wafers at a waiting section accessible to both robots.

Claims 15-17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueyama et al. and Herzog (4,961,267) and Tabata et al. Ueyama et al. discloses a wafer processing device that uses multiple end effectors to move wafers about but does not disclose using two dual link connectors to move the end effector. Herzog discloses a device for moving an end effector (fig3a) which uses two links to move the end effector about and the links each are r, theta type

Art Unit: 2837

joints. Tabata et al. discloses an r, theta joint that uses rotary connectors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the apparatus of Ueyama et al. to use multiple r, theta joints and to use angle r, theta joints because two joints as taught in Herzog provides redundancy and multiple angle joints as taught in Tabata et al. provide modularity (eg. ease of replacement).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueyama et al. and Herzog and Tabata et al. and Genov et al. (5,064,340). Ueyama et al. discloses a wafer processing apparatus that may be modified according to the teachings of Herzog and Tabata et al. to provide two dual jointed rotary connectors to position the end effector as discussed above but none of these references disclose using belts to transmit motion to a rotary axis. Genov et al. discloses a robotic arm that performs positioning control that locates the motors at one central location and drives each rotary joint via belts. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified the apparatus of Ueyama et al. to use belts because Genov et al. teaches that locating the motors at a extreme points creates heavier loads on extreme joints while moving the motors closer to the primary joint reduces the loads on the joints.

Claims 31, 35, 39, 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata et al. in view of Ueyama et al., and Corwin, Jr et al. Tabata et al. discloses a positioning apparatus that may be modified to provide an end effector as taught by Ueyama et al. and discussed above but neither of these references disclose multiple motion end effectors. Corwin,

Art Unit: 2837

Jr. et al. discloses an end effector that uses multiple axis of control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the apparatus of Tabata et al. to not only use an end effector as taught by Ueyama et al. but to use a multiple degree of motion end effector as taught by Corwin, Jr. et al. because there may be times when the end effector must move in a variety of direction to operate properly.

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Stevens discloses correction for alignment errors.

Maydan et al. discloses a multi chamber wafer processing system.

Kishi et al., MacNeal, Jr. et al., Miyake et al., Engelberger et al. ('941, '794), Koyano, Obigane, Cunningham et al., Bartholet, Moy et al., Merlet, Nagamatsu et al., Nakagawa et al., Poduje et al., Kitamura et al., Genov et al. (5,007,784), Maydan et al., Stevens all disclose robotic arm controllers that were cited in the parent.

Genov et al. (5,789,890) is the parent.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Sircus whose telephone number is (703) 308-3119, Monday through Thursday between 8:30 and 5:00.

Art Unit: 2837

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

The group fax number is (703) 305-3431 or -3432. Please identify the application number, the examiner, the art unit and a telephone number by which you may be reached on the cover page when sending a fax.

If necessary the examiner's supervisor, William Shoop, may be reached at (703) 308-3103.



**Brian Sircus
Primary Examiner
August 17, 1998**